



Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Re: Revised Venice Beach BID database

1 message

Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com>

Wed, Jun 15, 2016 at 11:14 AM

To: Garen Yegparian <garen.yegparian@lacity.org>

Cc: Mario Montez <mario.montez@lacity.org>, Dennis Rader <dennis.rader@lacity.org>

Garen:

Thank you for your review. Do you have a few minutes anytime today to discuss? Tyler is in Korea this week (not reachable) so I'd like to see if I can resolve this in his absence or not.

I may need to be at Metro between 1:30-3 pm but am otherwise open.

Warmest regards,
Tara

On Jun 13, 2016 4:41 PM, "Garen Yegparian" <garen.yegparian@lacity.org> wrote:

Hello Tara,

I've gone over the changes you addressed with the following results:

- 4286009091 - OK as modified
- 4286009092 - OK as modified
- 4286012041 - OK as modified
- 4286028021 - OK as modified
- 4286028022 - see below
- 4286028023 - see below
- 4286028024 - see below
- 4286028026 - see below
- 4286028027 - see below
- 4286028028 - see below
- 4286028029 - see below
- 4286028030 - see below
- 4286028031 - see below
- 4286008001 - OK as modified

For 4286028*** parcels, based on the fact that the two sets of APNs involved are in one building each, dividing up the frontage in the way you are proposing is not allowable. I looked in the assessment methodology, and did not see anything that specifically allows for this kind of allocation of frontage. If there is something I'm missing, please let me know, and this will be wrapped up quickly, since the arithmetic itself is correct.

Thank you for your patience, Tara.

On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 6:19 PM, Tara Devine <tara@devine-strategies.com> wrote:

I know I sometimes struggle to keep track of these documents and versions, so just to make it easier, here is the most current version again. As you may recall, Tyler submitted a bunch on changes on 5/23, and I made one more the following day (5/24.)

Tyler's notes on his changes (5/23):

Attached please find an updated database for Venice Beach BID. The changes are reflected in the first tab labeled as VB Assessments-Updated, and the second tab labeled as VB Assessments-Original is there as a reference.

I made changes to the following APNs:

- 4286009091 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.

- 4286009092 - Added bldg sf based on assessor's map, but County Assessor's website doesn't have any bldg sf.
- 4286012041 - Split the APN to two (4286012044 & 4286012045) and deleted the 041 as County has updated the APN
- 4286028021 - Reduced bldg sf by 100, and reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028022 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028023 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028024 - Reduced frontage to 64 and lot sf to 2979 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028026 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028027 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028028 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028029 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028030 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg
- 4286028031 - Reduced frontage to 47 and lot sf to 2598 due to a commercial space in the same bldg

The changes will decrease the total assessment by \$4,904.61 which is approximately 0.26% change.

My notes on my change (5/24):

- 4286008001- We have removed 187 from the F-commercial column (AS) as it is duplicative. The correct frontage of 186.82 remains in the F-residential column (AV.) The very first database was correct; we believe that somewhere during review/revisions that the frontage was accidentally added in again in the commercial column, resulting in a double charge for frontage. We reviewed other parcels looking for duplicate frontage; we found the error was isolated to this APN.

This results in that APN's assessment being reduced from \$5859.49 to \$3,150.60 and a corresponding reduction in the total budget.

Total change to budget during petition stage: -\$7,613.50

Warmest regards,

TARA DEVINE
 DEVINE STRATEGIES
 645 West Ninth St.,#110-293
 Los Angeles, CA 90015
 310.430.5121
 tara@devine-strategies.com

Making it easier for you with STRATEGIC CONSULTING SERVICES
Planning & Entitlements - Political & Community Outreach - Business Improvement Districts

--
 Garen Yegparian
 213/978-2621